REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 6, 2004 ("the current Office Action"). Claims 1-7, 22, 24, 25, 57-60, 62, 64-69, 74, 75, 77-79, 84, 85, and 87-89 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1-6 and 57-59 are in independent form. Claims 1-3 have been amended simply to clarify those claims, and not for reasons relating to any of the rejections discussed below. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-7, 22, 24, 25, 57-60, 62, 64-69, 74, 75, 77-79, 84, 85, and 87-89 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,778,377 (Marlin et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and submit that independent Claims 1-6 and 57-59, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from Marlin et al. for at least the following reasons.

An aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to a method of acquiring information related to a selected network device of a plurality of network devices, and displaying the acquired information of the selected network device. According to the method, in a first display step, a first information related to the selected network device is acquired via a network and displayed on an initial screen of a device window. The device window is a window allocated to the selected network device. In a second display step, after displaying the first information and in response to a user request for display of a second screen different from the initial screen, a second information is acquired from the selected network device via the network. The second information is additional and different from the first information, and is displayed on the second screen.

Marlin et al. relates to a table-driven graphical user interface (GUI). The GUI is used by workstations on a network to control a complex operation. As understood by Applicants, Marlin et al. teaches that at least one node on the network is a Desktop Management Interface (DMI) with an object-oriented database for storing data objects for the complex operation. The GUI is generic to any complex operation, but requires the DMI for access to data. The DMI is probed with commands generated by the GUI to obtain and display requested data. (See the abstract.)

Marlin et al. also is understood to disclose a technique for storing device information in a database called a Management Information Format (MIF) file 33 (see column 5, lines 19-31). The MIF file database is maintained by a systems manager in a managing computer and not in a network device to be managed (see column 5, lines 23-26).

Nothing has been found in Marlin et al. that is believed to teach or suggest a method that includes "a first display step of acquiring a first information related to the selected network device via a network and displaying the first information on an initial screen of a device window, which is a window allocated to the selected network device," and "a second display step of acquiring, in response to a user request for display of a second screen different from the initial screen after displaying the first information, a second information, which is additional and different from the first information, from the selected network device via the network and displaying the second information on the second screen," as recited in Claim 1.

In regard to the first display step, it is alleged in the Office Action dated

February 12, 2003 ("the previous Office Action"),[1] that Marlin et al. discloses this step at column 15, lines 1-24. The cited portion of Marlin states the following:

> Basically, the GUI provides the user with the ability to manage the information in the database in the manner in which the user has interest. For example, a machine operator may wish to manage the database information in a particular fashion, while a facilities manager might be interested in looking at that same data to produce a different report. The GUI provides a simple mechanism for defining the reports that the particular user desires. This is accomplished by providing a table driven interface in the DMI environment.
>
> The structure of the GUI is shown in FIGS. 9-14. With reference to FIG. 9, when use of the GUI commences, an initialization process 300 is begun which includes starting the status timer to update the time on the status bar each minute. At step 301, various login processing is performed to establish the user/account session. At this time, the account name, password, and server/host name is received by the GUI. The GUI makes connection to the DMI network service layer on the server using the host name. The account file may be searched for the account record, the account name and the password. The user name is obtained from the account record together with polling intervals, action flags, and "get" permissions. A report list is built including a control flag for each group in a group list. A poll timer is started to initiate polling for each polling interval.

Applicants are unable to find anything in the above-quoted portion of Marlin et al. that relates to the "initial screen" of Claim 1, which displays the acquired first information related to the selected network device. As recited in Claim 1, the initial screen refers to "an initial screen of a device window, which is a window allocated to the selected network device."

Should the Examiner disagree, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to

---

[1] The current Office Action adopts the same rejections as those presented in the Office Action dated February 12, 2003.

more particularly point out where in the above-quoted portion of Marlin et al. there is even a suggestion of the "initial screen" of Claim 1.

The previous Office Action (at section 2) appears to assert that Marlin et al. shows a GUI display in Figs. 5 and 8, and that the GUI display somehow discloses or suggests displaying acquired information of a selected network device. Applicants respectfully note, however, that Fig. 5 shows a schematic depiction of a mailroom network, and Fig. 8 shows a model of a desktop management interface. Neither Fig. 5 nor Fig. 8 are understood to show a GUI. Further, neither Fig. 5 nor Fig. 8 are understood to even suggest displaying acquired information of a selected network device.

The current Office Action states that Marlin et al., in Figs. 4 and 5, teaches "acquiring a device information over the network as claimed because devices are connected the management system via a network." However, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the relevant art would not understand Figs. 4 and 5 to show a selected device, or acquiring a first information related to the selected network device, or displaying the first information on an initial screen of a device window, which is a window allocated to the selected network device, as claimed in Claim 1.

In regard to the second display step, it is alleged in the current and previous Office Actions that Marlin et al. at various portions of columns 14-16 discloses this step. Applicants submit that in the second display step a second information, which is additional and different from the first information, is acquired in response to a user request after displaying the first information, and the second information is displayed on a second screen different from the

initial screen. As discussed above, Marlin et al. fails to teach or suggest the initial screen. Therefore, Marlin et al. could not teach or suggest the second screen of Claim 1, which displays the second information acquired in response to a user request *after* displaying the first information on the initial screen.

It is now well established that a claim is anticipated only if "each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814, F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP 2131. Applicants respectfully submit that Marlin et al. fails to describe all the features of the first and second display steps of Claim 1, and therefore fails to anticipate Claim 1. Further, one of ordinary skill in the relevant art would find no suggestion in Marlin et al. to modify the technique disclosed therein in the manner of Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Marlin et al. and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Independent Claims 2-6 and 57-59 include features similar to those discussed above, and therefore are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Additionally, the other claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and therefore are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Nevertheless, because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

CONCLUSION

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants
Lock See Yu-Jahnes
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 400486v1